

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 2-6, 9-13, 16-18, 20 and 21 remain canceled. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 remain in the application. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 now more clearly articulates that the specific broadcast driven group of peers among multiple groups of peers on a peer-to-peer network enables peers to connect and interact via the P2P network within the context of the broadcast via a CRID that is resolved into a peer group ID. (See, for example, the present specification on page 4, lines 17-18). In addition, claim 1 more clearly articulates enabling a virtual private network connection (i.e., linking via a virtual private network connection *within the context of the content broadcast*) the specific broadcast driven group of peers using the specific CRID which was resolved into the peer group ID to form a "virtual private network" that improves the scalability by routing messages *only* through members of that group and *not* to all peers on the network." (See, for example, the present specification on page 2, lines 22-23).

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0237097 A1 to *Marshall et al.* ("**Marshall**") in view of U.S. Patent No. US 7,552,460 B2 to *Goldman, Phillip Y.*, ("**Goldman**") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120634 A1 to *Koike et al.* ("**Koike**"). With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that the **Marshall**, **Goldman** and **Koike** references are defective in establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

Independent claim 1, as now presented, more clearly recites, inter alia, the specific feature limitation of "responsive to [a] *specific identifier* being derived [at an end-user site and resolved into a peer group ID], enabling at the end-user site a virtual private network connection to the specific broadcast driven group of peers via the peer-to-peer network *within a context of the content broadcast* to form a virtual private network that improves a scalability by routing messages *only* through members of that group and *not to all peers* on a network" (emphasis added). Support for the amendments to claim 1 (as well as for claims 8, 15 and 19) can be found in the specification at least on page 2, lines 22-23; and page 4, lines 3 and 17-18.

Applicant submits that neither Marshall, Goldman nor Koike discloses at least the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1. In addition, it is submitted that the citations to **Marshall, Goldman** and **Koike** do not disclose at least the claimed virtual private network connection to the specific broadcast driven group of peers and a virtual private network that improves a scalability by routing messages *only* through members of that group and *not to all peers* on a network. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination of **Marshall, Goldman** and **Koike** is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Office Action contends that **Marshall, Goldman** and **Koike** in combination disclose "responsive to deriving the specific identifier, enabling a connection to the specific broadcast driven group of peers via the peer-to-peer network within a context of the content broadcast (*Marshall* discloses of a peer user using the PVR to browse or search for the specific content or other peers, combined with *Goldman's* teachings of browsing through the EPG for specific or requested identifiers (which can be the TV-anytime CRIDs from *Koike*), linking to groups of peers or buddies with similar interests. Once found, the user can join and be a part of that group or at least be associated with that group, e.g., *Goldman*, Figure 5, columns 9, lines 44-49, column 10,

lines 62-64, column 11, lines 1-7 and 33-40)." (Office Action, page 8). This contention is respectfully traversed, in view of the present amendments to claim 1.

As amended herein, independent claim 1 now more clearly recites "responsive to [a] *specific identifier* being derived [at an end-user site and resolved into a peer group ID], enabling at the end-user site a virtual private network connection to the specific broadcast driven group of peers via the peer-to-peer network *within a context of the content broadcast* to form a virtual private network that improves a scalability by routing messages *only* through members of that group and *not to all peers* on a network" (emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that the "virtual private network connection to the specific broadcast driven group of peers" and "a *virtual private network* that improves a scalability by routing messages *only* through members of that group and *not to all peers* on a network" as recited in claim 1 does not read on the associated networks of **Marshall, Goldman and Koike**. Thus, **Marshall, Goldman and Koike** cannot be interpreted to disclose the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1, nor do they add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency indicated herein above.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested. The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Claims 8, 15 and 19 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments to claim 1. Accordingly, for similar reasons as stated with respect to overcoming the rejection of claim 1, claims 8, 15 and 19 are believed allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application. In addition, the Office Action contains a number of statements characterizing the claims, the Specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements are addressed by Applicant, Applicant refuses to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicant.

The matters identified in the Office Action of September 14, 2010 are now believed resolved. Accordingly, the application is believed to be in proper condition for allowance. The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael J. Balconi-Lamica/

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Edward Goodman, Reg. No. 28,613

Dated: December 10, 2010
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9611
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: PHNL031487US1

a-32658,440